

Mr. KNOTT. But you would have a limitation under the language I have suggested—the appraised fair market value.

Mr. GRAY. This is for our own benefit and guidance, but I was addressing my remarks to the danger of putting in the legislation that the rental would be contingent upon the appraisal. If we do that we may be getting ourselves into a higher rental.

Do you not see that danger if some appraiser comes back and says this property, within two blocks of the Capitol, is worth \$30 million and thinks the amount of rental should be based upon that fair market value?

Mr. KNOTT. I suggested in my statement the fair market value, but in no event to exceed \$3 million.

Mr. GRAY. Yes. I am not against the appraisal. I would hope this committee would not write in that we would base our rental strictly upon the appraised value of the property because, if it is more, then we would be subject to paying more. If we put a limitation in as you propose, this would protect us.

Mr. KNOTT. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Cramer?

Mr. CRAMER. To solve this problem that has just been discussed: would you not also insert before fair market value, "not to exceed the fair market rental value, subject to negotiation," as well as not to exceed \$3 million?

Mr. KNOTT. I believe that is in my statement, that the bill be revised to provide that the annual rental may not exceed the fair rental value determined by appraisal and in no event exceed \$3 million.

Mr. CRAMER. I think that answers the question of flexibility.

Mr. KNOTT. Right.

Mr. CRAMER. Your recommendation is that GSA only be consulted, not to make recommendations or approvals. Is that right?

Mr. KNOTT. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. Do you see any problem then with the language on page 4, line 5, relating to the assessed valuation of the leased properties not including for tax purposes, any increase in value by reason of the improvements made on such properties by said company?

You think it is a proper function of the Congress to write such language in the bill; is that correct?

Mr. KNOTT. We think they could so legislate; yes.

Mr. CRAMER. Section 8 of the bill suggests continuing studies relating to the needs of visitors to the Washington area, including therein the necessity and desirability of different or additional visitor centers, and to report to the President and the President to the Congress. That does not, however, in any way commit the Congress in the future, does it?

It means Congress shall consider the matter as it seems fit through future authorizations; is that correct?

Mr. KNOTT. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. It is not a commitment on the part of the Congress to approve additional centers in any way, is it?

Mr. KNOTT. I do not read it as committing them.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Schwengel?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. First I want to join in paying tribute to Mr. Knott for appearing here, not only for his statement, which is a very good summary of his studies and thoughts, but for the work that he and his staff along with the Secretary have done in preparation for this hear-